

# The Sun

SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 1904.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second-Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month.....\$5 00  
 DAILY, Per Year.....\$50 00  
 SUNDAY, Per Year.....\$5 00  
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year.....\$55 00  
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month.....\$5 00  
 Postage to foreign countries added.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at No. 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication will be so kind as to send them, they will find in all cases prompt attention.

Readers of THE SUN leaving the city can have the Daily and Sunday editions mailed to their addresses (which may be changed when necessary) for 70 cents a month. Order through your newsdealer or THE SUN, 170 Nassau street.

## Mr. Davis on the Rights of Labor.

This mystical utterance formed part of Mr. HENRY G. DAVIS's speech of acceptance, as actually delivered at White Sulphur Springs.

"I have always believed, and my convictions came from the hard school of experience, that, measured by the character of work he does and the cost of living, a man is entitled to full compensation for his services."

The luminous thought burst unexpectedly upon the country. It was not contained in the address as originally written, but was interpolated by Mr. DAVIS after listening to the Hon. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS's five act burlesque.

How did it get in? The matter was cleared up by the publication yesterday of a letter which Mr. DAVIS had written on Aug. 15 to Mr. I. V. JOHNSON of Roanoke, Virginia, concerning published statements that he was "hostile to the laboring class." We put in parallel columns parts of the letter to Mr. JOHNSON and parts of the passage added last Wednesday to his previously prepared speech of acceptance.

## THE SPEECH.

"For many years I worked in the ranks as a wage earner, and I know what it is to earn my living by the sweat of my brow."

"I have always believed, and my convictions came from the hard school of experience, that, measured by the character of work he does and the cost of living, a man is entitled to full compensation for his services."

It thus becomes evident that the dazed condition of mind in which the Hon. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS's sustained effort of humor left the venerable candidate is responsible for the interpolation in the speech of acceptance of parts of a private letter written or dictated by Mr. DAVIS only twenty-four hours before.

But what is "full compensation," and who is to decide upon the fulness thereof? And if a man is entitled to full compensation for his services, it is likewise Mr. DAVIS's conviction, acquired in the hard school of experience, that a man is entitled to full liberty of contract in the disposition of his labor, whenever, wherever and to whomsoever he pleases to sell the same?

An opinion on this latter question would have been worth having from the candidate for Vice-President. If he had uttered such an opinion, there might have been some significance in Mr. PARKER's telegram, "Congratulations upon your excellent speech of acceptance."

## The Porto Rican Argument for a Tariff on Coffee.

Porto Rican papers, such as the *Boletín Mercantil* of San Juan, *El Águila* of Ponce, and sundry others, flatly repudiate the views of THE SUN regarding the imposition of a tariff on coffee by which the Porto Rican berry would be so protected in the United States market that a profitable outlet would be assured here for all that the island can raise.

But it is gratifying to note that some of them at least realize that even our criticism of proposed solutions of Porto Rican difficulties is an honest effort in their behalf.

## The Boletín Mercantil, in its issue of July 23, says, as translated:

"We acknowledge that THE SUN is the only North American paper which concerns itself with the affairs of Porto Rico, and that its noble and disinterested efforts to discover the means of averting (literally, of conjuring or exorcising) the total ruin of Porto Rico is worthy of the gratitude of our people. It is in the consequence that our opinion differs from THE SUN because the citizens of the great republic to a sense of the duties which they have assumed in relation to this unhappy colony."

But it is apparent that they can see only one way in which those duties can be properly fulfilled, namely, by the imposition on coffee from all other countries a duty which will at least fairly protect the Porto Rican berry. From their point of view, the logic of some of their arguments cannot be denied, nor does it seem possible to deny the justice of their claims. Their arguments and claims may be summarized as follows: Porto Rico is in dire need. Her people are impoverished and hungry; many are in rags and some are starving. Their condition is due to no fault of their own. Their prosperity depends chiefly upon their ability to market profitably their crop of coffee, the chief product of the island, upon which the majority of the islanders are dependent. During the Spanish régime they sold their coffee in Europe at remunerative prices, and the people of the island were reasonably prosperous and contented. As a matter of fact, and absolutely, they were neither; but there is only too much reason to believe that, economically, they were in a better state than they have been since we assumed control of the island.

From the last collection of Porto Rican papers which has reached us, we select two arguments which are at least entitled to American consideration. *El Águila* of Ponce says:

"THE SUN refers to the imposition of Porto Rican tariff as a way which seems to imply that the Porto Ricans are asking a favor, and this is not so, we demand it as a right and nothing more. Our coffee is an American product, as is our sugar, and as such

it has the same right to protection under the Dingley tariff as have other American products. There is no reason whatever why one Porto Rican product should be regarded as American while others are not."

The logic of this, from the Porto Rican point of view, must be admitted. They are unable to see just why their minor products, such as sugar, fruit and tobacco, should be protected, while their major product, coffee, enjoys no such privilege. We trust that they will not think us ungracious in saying that the American tariff is framed, primarily, in the interest of the eighty million people who live on the mainland rather than in the interest of the one million who live in a sun-kissed gem of an island on the border of the Caribbean ocean.

Yet this may be supplemented by a proposition made by the *Boletín Mercantil*, which seems to concede the force of THE SUN's argument of an injustice in imposing a duty on hundreds of millions of pounds of coffee of the grade used by the great mass of our people, for the sake of giving protection to a few millions of pounds of a more expensive and much superior article. The *Boletín* asks whether it would be too much for Porto Rico to ask for the imposition of a duty only on such grades of coffee as come into competition with her product, leaving the cheaper and inferior grades, as they now are, on the free list.

If the Porto Ricans will advance a few more arguments of that calibre they will stand a much better chance of securing a hearing in this country. Meanwhile the Department of Agriculture, which is constantly engaged in such work, may well institute an investigation of the comparative merit and value of Porto Rican coffee. If one pound of that, worth 25 cents, will make an equal or a greater quantity of liquid coffee of a quality equal or superior to that which would result from the use of two pounds of Rio, worth 50 cents a pound, let us have official assurance of the fact. The Porto Ricans claim that one pound of their coffee is equivalent to four pounds of Rio or two pounds of that sold as Mocha. Let Dr. WILEY investigate and report.

## A New Chance for Home Rule.

Just as most of the British Liberals are revealing a resolve to fight mainly, if not exclusively, under the banner of free trade, and to drop the subject of home rule for Ireland in their next appeal to the constituencies, there comes once more an indication, as in the last half of 1885, that the wish of the Irish people for self-government may gain substantial, if not nominal, fulfillment at the hands of the Conservatives.

The *Daily Telegraph*, which will be recognized as a trustworthy mouthpiece of many Unionists, lately made in an editorial article the following suggestive statement:

"There is a large and growing number of politicians, while professing devotion to the Union, but fiscal reform before Unionism. There is an unsuspected large number of Tories whose sympathy with home rule was scotched but not absolutely killed by the methods adopted by various national leagues to obtain it. If Ireland continues as free from lawlessness and outrage-mongering in the future as she is at present, these scotched Tory home rulers may again raise their heads."

The Unionists who care more for fiscal reform, or, in other words, for protection, than they do for the union between Great Britain and Ireland are, of course, the followers of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They already constitute the preponderant element in the Unionist ranks, and although they have thus far refrained from asserting their ascendancy by compelling Mr. BALFOUR to accept their programme, they will undoubtedly assume control of the Unionist party when it becomes a minority, as it is expected to do in the next House of Commons. Should Mr. CHAMBERLAIN see fit, after the next general election, to enter into a coalition with the Irish Nationalists, he doubtless would be able to make his party swallow the draught which Lord CARNARVON and Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL pressed in vain on the Conservatives nineteen years ago.

Whether such a step will be taken by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN depends, in all likelihood, on the composition of the next House of Commons. We presume that he ever has been to any material concessions to the Irish demand for Home Rule, and if he valued a reputation for consistency he would feel himself stopped from making any by his repeated and emphatic denunciations of the project. No British statesman, however, not even Sir ROBERT PRESTON or Mr. GLADSTONE, has evinced more contempt for consistency than has the Member for West Birmingham, who from a rabid free trader has developed into the protectionist champion. The paramount object of his life is now to embody his preferential policy in legislation; and he must want to gratify his desire as speedily as possible, for he knows that he cannot look forward to many years of intellectual vigor. Some of his followers profess not to expect the fulfillment of their hopes until the next Parliament but one shall have assembled. It is scarcely credible, however, that Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, at his age, will submit to such delay, if he can possibly avoid it. If he can avert the postponement of his plan by propitiating the Irish Nationalists, he is scarcely likely to let the opportunity slip.

Now, it is believed by almost all observers of the actual political situation in Great Britain that the outcome of the next general election will be to give once more the balance of power in the House of Commons to the eighty-three Nationalist members. Few if any Unionists doubt that the Liberals, hoisting the free trade flag, will beat their party at the ballot box; but few even of the most sanguine Liberals imagine that their victory will be any more decisive than that which Mr. GLADSTONE gained in December, 1885. Then the Liberals, it may be remembered, secured almost exactly the same number of seats as was acquired by the Conservatives and Nationalists combined. Under the circumstances, Mr. GLADSTONE could not have carried on the Government without the aid of the Irish party. Recognizing the fact, he entered into the combination with Mr. PARNELL which resulted in the first Home Rule bill. There is good

reason to think, in view of his attitude at the general election then just ended and during the preceding twelvemonth, that the Irish leader would have preferred to cooperate with the Conservatives. But they, under Lord SALISBURY's leadership, repelled the suggestions of Lord CARNARVON and Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, and refused to bid against the Liberals for the support of the Home Rulers.

The chances are that Mr. CHAMBERLAIN will be much more sorely tempted than was Lord SALISBURY to accept assistance from the Home Rulers. In 1885-86 a Conservative-Nationalist coalition would have been unworkable, because it could have just managed to divide evenly the House of Commons. It is only, however, optimistic Liberals who fancy that their party will be as successful on the next appeal to the ballot box as Mr. GLADSTONE was nineteen years ago. It is much more probable that their victory will be limited to gaining from fifty to sixty seats from their opponents. In that event they would have a small plurality over the Conservatives, but neither of the two great parties would be able to form a Government without Nationalist cooperation.

If, then, the two great parties are likely to bid against each other for the support of the Home Rulers in the next House of Commons, which bid is likely to be accepted? It is obvious that the Unionists would have a great advantage over the Liberals in one particular, namely, that they would be able to make their promise good. The fate of the second Home Rule bill may be said to have proved that the Liberals can never carry a proposal to give the Irish people any large installment of local self-government through the House of Lords. On the other hand, the hereditary legislators will sanction almost any measure that comes to them stamped with the approval of the Unionists in the House of Commons. It may be that Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's offer would not be, on its face, so alluring as that made by his Liberal competitor, but the question for Nationalists to answer would be whether they would not prefer a bird in the hand to two in the bush.

## Holding Up Tom's Hands.

The Hon. TOM TAGGART's *Indiana Sentinel*, the official mouthpiece of the Democratic national committee, prints a beautiful speech, two and a quarter columns long, made by the Hon. JOHN W. KEATING, chairman of the Marion county Democratic convention. Marion county is the site of Mr. TAGGART and Indianapolis. Mr. KEATING paints a full-length portrait of the distinguished Indiana leader and strategist, under whose direction the Democratic campaign is going on so neatly and quietly that his mastery methods have even deceived Democrats who don't know how much deadlier mines are than the mere pop and screech of ostentatious bombardment. Let us look at the chief and do him honor:

"An honored and favored son of Indiana, a resident of our city, a brother in arms, if you please, has been selected as chairman of the national committee; step by step he has worked his way from the ranks to the leadership of his party; with untiring devotion he has labored constantly for his party and his principles; he has never failed in the least in his duty to the cause of his party. The Democracy of Indiana commended him to the Democracy of the nation as an organizer of superb ability, as a leader of keen discernment and sound discretion, qualified in the highest degree to discharge the arduous duties of the national chairmanship; they accepted him at our word; even now we are told they have discovered his wonderful capacity for organization, his personal magnetism and his influence upon men, are delighted with his selection and firmly convinced that no mistake has been made."

Mr. TAGGART himself is firmly convinced. Nobody kicks but a squeamish Mugwump or two. Indiana has given Taggart to the Democracy. The Democracy expects Indiana to do her duty:

"The eyes of the State and nation are upon us; much is expected of us, much is to be done; let us not mar the good record already made, or deviate from the high standard already set for us. Let us demonstrate that the cause of our party is not only a just cause, but a just cause, and with our old-time vigor and enthusiasm help to hold up the hands of TOM TAGGART."

The right spirit breathes from those words. Hold up Tom's hands—and pull his leg!

## Across Sea for Kaiser's Cup.

At last the Kaiser has invaded America. It has long been feared that he would be a challenger for the America's Cup, but that danger, it seems, is averted for the present. The Kaiser has defeated Sir THOMAS LIPTON, not in capturing a cup, but in giving one. This cup is to be the emblem of victory in a race eastward across the Western Ocean. Already the owners of several of the big two-stickers have signified their intention of starting their craft in this tussle, and it is expected that some British and German yachts will enter the Meteor. But without his own spectacular figure at the helm she would carry only a faint, memorial glory.

Long distance yacht racing, as we have on previous occasions pointed out, admits of too many uncertainties to be regarded as a true test of the comparative speed of yachts. But we have also noted that it cherishes that spirit of adventure to which the mastery of man over the seas is chiefly to be credited. To brave the dangers of the trackless waste in a pleasure craft is surely inspiring, and to win in a contest which carries hazard with it from one end to the other is a fine thing.

There is still another matter worth considering. The series of contests for the America's Cup has served to foster a belief that American yachts are swift only when they are mere racing shells. A dash across the Atlantic is certainly not an undertaking for a skinned-out marine animal, a huge tin canoe with a stovepipe for a mast. The winner in such a race must be not only speedy, but also sound.

If half a dozen American yachts start, six of them will cross the finish line. One of those six will probably be the winner. The demonstration will be encouraging for all believers in the ability of American designers to turn out seagoing yachts that can sail fast. Therefore bring on your British and German transatlantic

racers. It's a long way over and a long way back, but our yachtsmen will courteously show the visitors the way home.

## The Basis of Harmony.

Under the leadership of that earnest Parker enthusiast Mr. BRYAN, the Democrats and Populists of Nebraska have divided the nominations on a Fusion State ticket. Both Populists and Democrats keep an electoral ticket in the field, so that there may be no doubt that Roosevelt will carry the State. Thus they can give their undivided attention to the high problem, which is stated, rudely but fairly, by a Republican organ in their State, the *Verdige Citizen*:

"It isn't a question of principle any more with the Democrats of Nebraska. The only question to be determined is, how the hell are we going to get the office?"

The offices are more than a question of principle. They are a principle; that is, a fundamental tenet of politicians; and so they have been since politics began. This year they may well be more than a principle, more than a cause, an object and a hope.

It is clear that political platforms are not to be taken seriously. With perfect gravity the Democracy kicks away its holiest beliefs of 1896 and 1900. In effect it says to the voters, "Oh, forget it." The offices are the one fount of peace and basis of harmony.

About the trusts and the Philippines and such small deer there is much difference of opinion among Democrats. The "admirable" platform is admirably vague in parts. The candidate's utterances are already the subject of perplexity and commentary. There is one clear issue which can prevent doubt and confusion and discord.

Pipe all hands for that noble issue, so coarsely put by the *Verdige Citizen*: "How the hell are we going to get the offices?"

THE SUN cannot adopt itself to the idea that a trust is a good thing. It is a good thing for commerce.—*Buffalo Commercial*.

But what a magnificent thing for the grocery business!

## A student of political history asks:

"Why do you say this morning that Governor HILL 'promptly' appointed Surrogate-CHAMBERLAIN to the judicial vacancy caused by the death of Judge WATSON? You quote at the same time the *Verdige Citizen* as saying that HILL is 'deliberately' delaying that appointment."

Promptly after the election; not promptly after the occurrence of the vacancy. Mr. PARKER completed his labors as Surrogate-Chairman on election day, Nov. 3. On Nov. 11, Governor HILL appointed him as a Justice of the Supreme Court. "It is generally understood," he said, "that his appointment is a reward for successfully managing the Democratic machine this fall."

It's only justice to say that the Hon. THOMAS H. TIBBLES is the most Roman and impressive of the candidates for Vice-President; and that the Hon. TOM WATSON is as full of ginger as they make 'em.

The *Herald* beats the gong and yells that "New York Democrats must wake up." That's a matter of opinion. The Hon. PAT MCCARREN, for example, probably believes that certain New York Democrats, notably the Hon. CHARLES F. MURPHY, must shut up.

Mr. WATSON, his thin kindly face lighted up with a smile.—*World*.

Lighted from above, Mr. WATSON has good red pigment in his hair as in his speech.

Welcome to an old friend, the Hon. ERING WINSLOW of the Anti-Imperialist League! From the caves of oblivion he comes up shouting. His heart beats fiercely for Judge PARKER and Dump the Philippines. With all his old engaging simplicity he makes himself a sort of official interpreter of Judge PARKER's Omaha saying, "He is a wonder and a joy. He came over, so to speak, in the Mayflower. He has a mighty influence in Kilby street. We hear that he has promised Judge PARKER the solid Maeterlinck vote in Boston."

"THE WOODRUFF will be the candidate for Governor and he will be elected."—MR. MICHAEL J. DADY.

We think not.

## The Factional Troubles in the Nineteenth.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Your paper has always stood for purity and fair representation in politics, and has ever been first to denounce the tricks of those who maintain their claims to bosom after defeat at the polls.

The struggle that is strengthening the Republicanism in the Nineteenth Assembly district is one of local political rights, one that triumphed in Mr. QUIGG's defeat on several occasions and regained Republican ascendancy here after Mr. QUIGG's elimination from the demonstration brought about by his affiliations and management.

Mr. Gilman's leadership is opposed by those who are not in sympathy with his policy. He has made him leader, for the reason of his own party, and he has broken the breaking of his pledges not to support Mr. QUIGG in any shape or form.

What claim has Mr. QUIGG to dominate political affairs in this district or to represent this district at Chicago or anywhere else? Certainly there was no crisis in Mr. QUIGG's candidacy, even if Mr. QUIGG could be accused of anxiety in the early days to consummate Mr. Roosevelt's nomination, or in any way to add to the certainty and brilliancy of his own party's success.

There will be no Republican vote lost in this district, but many voters through this canvass. As in well understood, no change in party management takes place until after the Presidential election.

Party men mean party strength and good nominations, when the side wind that especially desires such result.

We trust you for fair treatment and to aid us in having voters examine into the merits of this controversy.

H. W. FOOTE.

NEW YORK, AUG. 19.

## England's Railroad Crossings.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: A correspondent of your valued paper recently said that England "never allows a grade crossing to be without compelling the railroad to build a bridge over it."

It is not correct. There are throughout England many grade crossings, but at each crossing there are gates, with watchmen, who are there as early as the dawn of day, and as late as the dusk, to see that the trains do not collide with the cars and other vehicles, both by train and in vehicles over the public roads, and encountered many grade crossings, when the side wind that especially desires such result.

## THE AMERICAN DOCTRINE OF NEUTRALITY.

Russia's Invasion of Our Rights of Commerce Not to Be Tolerated.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: The people of the United States have been awaiting with some impatience the action of our State Department in reference to the recent outrages perpetrated upon American commerce by the Russian navy, and they will receive with great satisfaction the information of Mr. Hay's emphatic protest to the Russian Government.

The action of that Government in its reckless and defiant disregard of the rights of neutral nations is only an illustration of the truth that "Whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad." In her present condition Russia is sorely in need of friends, yet she seems bent upon making enemies of all the great Powers. Sinking neutral ships, confiscating neutral cargoes, robbing neutral mails, violating neutral harbors, she seems to be running amuck against the civilization of the world. That such a course will be tolerated by other nations is hardly probable, that it will be endured by the United States is impossible.

As yet Russia's offences against the United States have been confined to the seizure or destruction of American cargoes shipped to neutral ports or to private individuals in unblockaded Japanese ports, but this involves the right of this country to engage in commerce with the outside world. That our Government will allow Russia to obstruct this right is not to be supposed for a moment. In our infancy we went to war with both England and France to maintain it, and now that we have grown to a nation of 80,000,000 people we shall hardly submit to the spoliation of our commerce by Russia.

The right of neutral nations to enjoy their ordinary commerce without interruption from belligerents is the most essential principle of international law. In 1758 Vattel thus stated it:

"That the commerce of nations may subsist in a degree of freedom as is consistent with the laws of nature, there are certain rules to be observed. The first is, carefully to distinguish ordinary goods from contraband. The second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The tenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eleventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The twelfth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The thirteenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fourteenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fifteenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The sixteenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The seventeenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eighteenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The nineteenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The twentieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The twenty-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The twenty-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The twenty-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The twenty-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The twenty-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The twenty-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The twenty-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The twenty-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The twenty-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The thirtieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The thirty-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The thirty-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The thirty-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The thirty-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The thirty-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The thirty-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The thirty-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The thirty-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The thirty-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fortieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The forty-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The forty-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The forty-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The forty-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The forty-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The forty-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The forty-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The forty-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The forty-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fiftieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fifty-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fifty-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fifty-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fifty-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fifty-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fifty-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fifty-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fifty-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The fifty-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The sixtieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The sixty-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The sixty-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The sixty-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The sixty-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The sixty-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The sixty-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The sixty-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The sixty-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The sixty-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The seventieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The seventy-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The seventy-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The seventy-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The seventy-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The seventy-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The seventy-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The seventy-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The seventy-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The seventy-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eightieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eighty-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eighty-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eighty-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eighty-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eighty-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eighty-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eighty-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eighty-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The eighty-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The ninetieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundredth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-tenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-eleventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-twelfth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-thirteenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fourteenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fifteenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-sixteenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-seventeenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-eighteenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-nineteenth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-twentieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-twenty-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-twenty-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-twenty-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-twenty-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-twenty-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-twenty-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-twenty-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-twenty-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-twenty-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-thirtieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-thirty-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-thirty-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-thirty-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-thirty-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-thirty-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-thirty-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-thirty-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-thirty-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-thirty-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fortieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-forty-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-forty-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-forty-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-forty-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-forty-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-forty-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-forty-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-forty-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-forty-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fiftieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fifty-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fifty-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fifty-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fifty-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fifty-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fifty-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fifty-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fifty-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-fifty-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-sixtieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-sixty-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-sixty-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-sixty-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-sixty-fourth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-sixty-fifth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-sixty-sixth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-sixty-seventh is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-sixty-eighth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-sixty-ninth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-seventieth is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-seventy-first is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-seventy-second is, not to allow contraband to be used for warlike purposes. The hundred-seventy-third is, not to allow contraband to be used for